



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/046,117 | 01/11/2002 | Peter A. Yared | 16159.020001; P6415 | 1021 |
| 32615 | 7590 | 03/02/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010 | | | TIV, BACKHEAN | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2151 | |
| DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/046,117 | YARED ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Backhean Tiv | 2151 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/23/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claims 12-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11, 23 have been cancelled. This is a response to the amendments filed on 11/23/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-18, 20, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2002/0029375 issued to Mlynarczyk et al.(Mlynarczyk) in view of US 6,141,792 issued to Acker et al.(Acker).

As per claim 12, 22 Mlynarczyk teaches distributed computer system, comprising: a client(Abstract, Fig.1);
a server operatively connected to the client (Abstract, Fig.1);
a client-side transport packager located on the client(Abstract, Fig.1);
a server-side transport packager located on the server(Abstract, Fig.1);
creating an internal representation using a root object of the object graph (paragraph [0033], [0039] & [0043] and Fig. 4; wherein the local system is creating or replicating the same inheritance hierarchy as in the server S. Smart PA and Smart PB

are internally representing interface A and interface B on the server where the interfaces are inheriting base class or root class represented by the RMI block);

instantiating a cast object graph using a casting rule and the internal representation (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B classes); and

Mlynarczyk however, does not explicitly teach a variable usage specification used to transport necessary object attributes , wherein the cast object graph comprises a plurality of objects, wherein each of the plurality of objects references at least another one of the plurality of objects, wherein a original name associated with each of the plurality of objects is modified in accordance with the casting rule, and wherein the casting rule defines how to modify the original name associated with each of the plurality objects.

Acker teaches a variable usage specification used to transport necessary object attributes(col.5, lines 47-52), wherein the cast object graph comprises a plurality of objects(Fig.3-12, col.5, lines 40-50), wherein each of the plurality of objects references at least another one of the plurality of objects(Figs.3-12, col.4, lines 57-67, col.5, lines 40-50), wherein a original name associated with each of the plurality of objects is modified in accordance with the casting rule(Figs.3-12, col.4, lines 57-67, col.5, line 40-col.6, line 16), and wherein the casting rule defines how to modify the original name associated with each of the plurality objects(Figs.3-12, col.4, lines 57-67, col.5, line 40-col.6, line 16).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mlynarczyk to explicitly teach the use of cast object graph and the use of casting rules as taught by Acker in order to efficiently develop and customize software and to encapsulate data and function of objects(Acker, col.1, lines 15-25).

One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Mlynarczyk and Acker in order to provide a system to build packaging and manipulating object oriented programs(Acker, col.1, lines 53-56).

As per claim 13, Mlynarczyk teaches further comprising: instantiating a cast object graph attribute using the casting rule and the internal representation (paragraph [0040]; when the object graph is cast to a different name, the attributes are implicitly cast).

As per claim 14, the distributed computer system further comprising: means for retrieving the root object using a variable usage specification(Acker, col.5, lines 47-52).
Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12.

As per claim 15, Mlynarczyk teaches further comprising: obtaining a class definition, wherein the class definition is used to create the internal representation (paragraph [0033]; wherein when the creation of objects are initiated the system has to reference the class definition to create and instantiate the object which has internal representation).

As per claim 16, Mlynarczyk teaches wherein the class definition is generated at runtime by a transport packager (paragraph [0039]; wherein when the system is replicating the same inheritance hierarchy at runtime in RMI, the class definition has to be used in order for the system to define the features of the objects).

As per claim 17, Mlynarczyk teaches wherein the casting rule comprises a casting method (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B classes).

As per claim 18, Mlynarczyk teaches wherein the casting method implements a mapping method (paragraph [0040]; wherein the casting rule is the encapsulation of the references to the remote objects in the naming system where the references maps to the local SmartProxy A and SmartProxy B classes).

As per claim 20, the distributed computer system wherein the cast method implements a parser method(Acker, col.6, lines 1-5). Motivation to combine set forth in claim 12.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2002/0029375 issued to Mlynarczyk et al.(Mlynarczyk) in view of US 6,141,792 issued to Acker et al.(Acker) in further view of US Patent 4,853,843 issued to Ecklund.

As per claim 19 Mlynarczyk in view of Acker teaches all the limitations of claims 17 however, fails to explicitly teach the casting method implements a suffix method.

Ecklund teaches a method of adding a suffix to make an object name unique (col. 19 lines 4-10 and col. 40 lines 1-2).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mlynarczyk in view of Acker to add a suffix to make an object name unique as taught by Ecklund in order for resolving name conflicts among objects (col. 40 lines 1-5 Ecklund).

One would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Mlynarczyk, Acker, and Ecklund to provide a system to resolve name conflicts among objects(Ecklund, col.40, lines 1-5).

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2002/0029375 issued to Mlynarczyk et al.(Mlynarczyk) in view of US 6,141,792 issued to Acker et al.(Acker) in further view of US Patent 6,125,400 issued to Cohen et al.(Cohen).

As per claim 21, Mlynarczyk in view of Acker fails to explicitly teach the internal representation is a serialized file.

Cohen teaches serializing an object with internal representation before transporting to the remote site(col. 2 lines 32-50).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Mlynarczyk in view of Acker to use serializing an object with internal

representation before transporting to the remote site as taught by Cohen in order to reduce the amount of information sent to invoke a remote application (Cohen, col. 2 lines 5-10).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Mlynarczyk, Acker, and Cohen in order to provide a system to reduce the amount of information sent to invoke a remote application (Cohen, col. 2 lines 5-10).

Response to Arguments

The applicant has cancelled claims 1-11, 23, therefore the examiner is withdrawing the 101 rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

US Publication 2002/0116412 issued to Barnes et al. Abstract, Fig.1-8

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

B7

Backhean Tiv
2151

2/27/06


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER